

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12-22, 25-35, 38 and 39 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 1, 14 and 27 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 14 and 27 were subject to objection for reciting optional limitations. Those claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore requested.

Claims 1-9, 12-22, 25-35, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert in view of McRae. The Office concedes that Albert does not teach that one field of a data packet is processed in parallel by multiple filter operations, but asserts that McRae does so in Figure 12, column 5, lines 24-47, and column 9, lines 19-41. Applicant respectfully traverses. At column 9, lines 19-21, McRae specifically states that “at packet classification time, a packet field value is sectioned into fields and **entered into their respective first lookup tables.**” (emphasis added) In other words, each field is entered into only one lookup table. This contrasts with the presently claimed invention which would enter the same field into multiple lookup tables for parallel filtering, assuming lookup tables were being used for filtering. Claim 1 recites this distinguishing feature as “performing at least two of a plurality of filter operations on the same data field in the data packet in accordance with the retrieved filter result, whereby one field of the data packet is processed in parallel with multiple filter operations.” Similarly, claim 14 recites “performing at least two of a plurality of filter operations on the same data field in the data packet in accordance with the retrieved filter result, whereby one field of the data packet is processed in parallel with multiple filter operations,” and claim 27 recites “performing at least two of the filter operations on the same data field in the data packet

in accordance with the retrieved filter result, whereby one field of the data packet is processed in parallel with multiple filter operations.” Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 14 and 27 based on the combination of Albert in view of McRae is therefore requested. Claims 2-9, 12-13, 15-22, 25-26, 28-35, 38 and 39 are dependent claims which further distinguish the inventions, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-9, 12-22, 25-35, 38 and 39 based on Albert in view of McRae is therefore also requested.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-4001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

July 31, 2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-098